

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/598,736	06/21/2000	Toru Takayama	SEL 189	5820	
7:	590 03/24/2006	EXAMINER			
Mark J Murph	•	VU, HUNG K			
COOK ALEX MCFARRON MANZO CUMMINGS & MEHLER LTD 200 West Adams Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Suite 2850		2811			
Chicago, IL 60606			DATE MAILED: 03/24/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					\$				
Office Action Summary		Application	No.	Applicant(s)					
		09/598,736		TAKAYAMA ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Hung Vu		2811					
The M Period for Reply	AILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the c	over sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
WHICHEVER - Extensions of tir after SIX (6) MO - If NO period for - Failure to reply value and reply received.	ED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY R IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAME may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 NOTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, ed by the Office later than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS 36(a). In no event, will apply and will experies the applica	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tim kpire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this com (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
2a) This ac	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 February 2006</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
closed	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of C	laims								
4a) Of the first	s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application. the above claim(s) is/are withdraw s) 28-39 is/are allowed. s) 1-27 and 40-52 is/are rejected. s) is/are objected to. s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from cons							
Application Pap	ers								
10) The dra Applicar Replace	ecification is objected to by the Examiner wing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept that any objection to the comment drawing sheet(s) including the correction or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) drawing(s) be lition is required	neld in abeyance. See if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to: See 37 CFF					
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. § 119								
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notice of Draft3) Information Dis	rences Cited (PTO-892) sperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) sclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) ail Date <u>2/23/06</u> .	5	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da Notice of Informat P Other:	te	152)				

Application/Control Number: 09/598,736

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on 02/23/06 has been entered. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-16, 18-27, 40, 42-47 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa et al. (PN 4,770,948, of record) in view of Prall et al. (PN 5,341,016, of record).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 40, Oikawa et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a semiconductor device, the semiconductor device comprising,

wirings including a gate electrode (5) formed over a substrate (1), the wirings comprising a tungsten film,

Application/Control Number: 09/598,736

Art Unit: 2811

wherein the wirings includes at least one inert element, and 90% or more of the inert element is argon, and

wherein an amount of sodium contained within the tungsten film is equal to or less than 0.3 ppm.

Oikawa et al. does not specifically disclose a tungsten nitride film formed under the tungsten film. However, Prall et al. discloses the wiring comprising a tungsten film (34) and a tungsten nitride film (33). Note Figures 5 and 7, and Col. 5., lines 1-20 of Prall et al.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the wirings of Oikawa et al. having a tungsten nitride film under the tungsten film, such as taught by Prall in order to improve the adhesion between the wiring and a gate dielectric film.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 9-11, 13, 21-23, 25, 45-47, 49 and 52, although Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. do not teach the thickness of the tungsten nitride film and the tungsten film, the electrical resistivity and the internal stress, the line width, the resistance, and the thickness of the wiring, as that claimed by Applicants, however, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the wiring having a desired thickness, resistivity, internal stress, line width, or resistance, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 6-8, 18-20, 40 and 42-44, although Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. do not disclose other inert element (Xe or Kr) is contained within the wiring at an amount equal to or

Application/Control Number: 09/598,736

Art Unit: 2811

less than 0.1 atom% or an amount of oxygen contained within the wiring is equal to or less than 1 wt%. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the wiring having a desired amount of other inert element or oxygen, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 14, 15, 24, 26, 27, 50 and 51, Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. do not disclose the semiconductor device is an active matrix type liquid crystal display, an active matrix type EL display, or an active matrix type EC display, or a video camera, a digital camera, a projector, a goggle type display, a car navigation system, a personal computer, or a portable information terminal. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the device of Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. into the devices as claimed in order to perform the desire function.

Regarding claim 16, Oikawa et al. does not disclose an insulating film comprising SiOxNy formed over the wiring. However, Prall et al. discloses an insulating film (21) comprising SiOxNy formed over the wiring. Note Figures 5 and 7 of Prall et al.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a cap layer over the wiring of Oikawa et al., such as taught by Prall et al. in order to increase the adhesion of the wiring and to protect the wiring during etching.

3. Claims 5, 12, 17, 41, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa et al. (PN 4,770,948, of record) in view of Prall et al. (PN 5,341,016, of record) and further in view of Ikeda et al. (JP8-153722, of record)

Regarding claims 5, 12, 17, 41 and 48, Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. disclose the invention substantially as claimed, including the device as cited in the rejections of claims 4, 16, 28 and 40, the wiring is used as a gate of the MOS with the gate insulating film (4). Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. do not disclose the wiring is used as a gate electrode of a TFT. However, Ikeda et al. discloses the wiring is used as a gate electrode of a TFT or MOS with a semiconductor film (104). Note Figure 13 of Ikeda et al.. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the wiring of Oikawa et al. and Prall et al. as the gate electrode for the TFT, such as taught by Ikeda et al. in order to increase the circuitry density.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 28-39 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 01/20/06 and 02/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued, at page 3 of the Remarks, that Oikawa discloses a concentration of sodium in a target, not within the metal film of the wiring, therefore, the sodium concentration of the target is not the same as the sodium concentration in the metal film of the wiring. The Examiner is

Art Unit: 2811

agreed. In fact, the sodium concentration should be less than that. However, the sodium concentration still meets the recited limitation of "equal to or less than".

It is argued, at page 4 of the Remarks, that Oidawa does not disclose a sodium concentration in other metals, such as tungsten. This argument is not convincing because Oikawa discloses, as shown in Col. 7, lines 56-65, that other metals can be used, such as tungsten.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1666. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday 6:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie C. Lee can be reached on (571) 272 - 1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2811

Vu

March 13, 2006

Hung Vu

Primary Examiner